REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are now pending and rejected in the application. Claim 54 has been amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-60 remain pending.

Support for the amendments is found in the specification as filed. Specifically, the chemical name for the abbreviations used in claim 54 are given, for example at paragraph 15 on page 5 and at paragraph 25 on page 7. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 54-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 54 to clarify the nature the components "S", TBzTD, and MBTS. Applicant respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 and 9-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the Wilson reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,620,871). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

A person is not entitled to a patent if the invention has been described in a patent published on an application made by another before the invention by Applicant. 35 U.S. C. §102(e). It is well established that "another" for purposes of § 102(e) means another than the Applicant. *See* for example *In re* Land, 151 USPQ 621, 630, and MPEP § 2136.04. An applicant's own work, whatever the form of disclosure to the public, may

not be prior art against the applicant, absent a statutory bar. *In re* Katz, 215 USPQ 14, 17. *See* also MPEP § 2132.01.

The Wilson reference cited in the Office Action is not prior art to the current invention under § 102(e) because it is not the work of another. The Wilson reference is work of the current inventor. The Wilson reference patent published on September 16, 2003, while the corresponding U.S. patent publication occurred on January 6, 2003. Both of those publication dates are less than one year before the filing of the current application. Because the Wilson reference is not a statutory bar, it cannot be used as prior art against work of the same inventor. Since the reference is not available as prior art, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-60 stand rejected as obvious in view of the Wilson reference, and further in view of the Teratani reference (U.S. Patent 6,001,185) and the Hakuta reference (U.S. Publication 2003/0096904). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

The Wilson reference is not available as prior art for the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully submits that the secondary references Teratani and Hakuta are insufficient by themselves to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Applicant believes claims 1-60 are in a state of allowability and requests an early Notice of Allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful to resolving any issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 18, 2005

By: Mark A. Frentrup

Mark A. Frentrup
Reg. No. 41,026
Attorney for Applicant

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

AMB/MAF/cg